

Serial No. 10/650,394
Atty. Dckt. No. 10021161-01

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appl. No.	:	10/650,394	Confirmation No. 6752
Appellant	:	Douglas Mark Kennedy	
Filed	:	August 28, 2003	
TC/A.U.	:	2179	
Examiner	:	Shashi Kamala Becker	
Docket No.	:	10021161-01	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed December 1, 2008.

Argument

1. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24 and 26-33 should not be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran (US 2004/0054688).

One of the limitations of appellant's claim 1 is a step of, "providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user". In response to appellant's assertion that Tran fails to teach this, the Examiner refers the Board to Tran's paragraphs [0038] and [0039], "wherein Tran speaks of an **authorized user** having **privileged access** to the system via a **password**." See, Answer, p. 9. Appellant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0033] is the only paragraph of Tran that refers to "privileged access" or a "password", and here, only in the context of access to the system 10 or a "component list". Appellant provided their analysis of paragraph [0033] in their Appeal Brief and will not repeat that analysis here.

Of note, Tran's paragraphs [0038] and [0039], Like much of Tran's disclosure, are directed toward how different types of users access a "component list", and not to how users are provided "interface pages to process an issue" (as recited in claim 1).

The Examiner's Answer further responds to appellant's arguments for the allowability of claim 1 by stating:

...Furthermore, Tran teaches a user/customer of an issue report is also provided with access to the system. Because the authorized user and user/customer have different abilities one can perform in the system (i.e. an authorized user can modify a component list where as a user/customer can not), it points out that the authorized user has a different access level than the user/customer.

Answer, p. 9.

Appellant disagrees with the Examiner's logic. That is, Tran teaches that an authorized user and a user/customer may have different rights for accessing a "component list". However, a "**component list**" is not an "**issue**". As a result, it does not follow that,

1) because Tran teaches that an authorized user and a user/customer have different rights for accessing a “component list”, a user is 2) provided “one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user”. In fact, nowhere does Tran disclose “providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of [a] user”.

The Examiner’s Answer further reiterates that:

. . . Tran suggests interface pages to process an issue on page 2 paragraph [0033] and page 3 paragraph [0038], where the authorized user logs in to the system, downloads the component list, modifies the component list and uploads the modified component list. This suggests a plurality of interface pages to process the issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user.

Answer, p. 9.

This is simply not true. Again, the Examiner is trying to equate Tran’s “component list” with an “issue” or “issue record”. The two are not the same. As disclosed in Tran’s paragraphs [0026] and [0033], a component list associates component names with responsible persons and is stored in a “database” (par. [0033]). Submitted “issue reports” are also stored in a “database” (par. [0031]). However, Tran does not indicate that the databases are the same database. More significantly, Tran does not indicate or suggest that “issue reports” are in any way stored in or linked to a “component list”. Rather, it seems that, when a user wants to identify an issue report (or find who is responsible for an issue), the user may access a component list to determine an appropriate “responsible person” for the issue report.

Appellant believes that, if the Board recognizes the important differences between Tran’s “component lists” and “submitted issue reports”, the Board will agree with appellant’s position regarding the allowability of claim 1 over Tran’s disclosure.

Another one of the limitations of appellant’s claim 1 is a step of, “providing an

embedded uniform resource locator of the issue record". In response to appellant's assertion that Trans fails to teach this, the Examiner refers the Board to Tran's paragraphs [0027], [0033] and [0037]. Again, the Examiner blurs the distinction between "component lists" and "issue reports" and implies that, because issue reports are "stored in a database categorized under the component names" (par. [0027]), then issue reports are stored in a "component list". This is not so. A component list associates component names and responsible persons (par. [0026]), but does not store issue reports. Although Tran indicates that 1) issue reports may be emailed, 2) component lists may be downloaded or accessed, and 3) responsible persons may be notified of issue reports, Tran fails to indicate that 4) "an embedded uniform resource locator of [an] issue record" is ever provided to anyone or anything. Nor does Tran indicate that anyone or anything can "link" to an issue report, as the Examiner suggests. Rather, it seems that users are only provided issue numbers of issue reports (par. [0031]), which the users can then use to look up issue reports.

For the above additional reasons, applicant asserts that Tran fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-10 and 12-14 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they ultimately depend from claim 1.

Claims 15, 17-24 and 26-33 are believed to be allowable, at least, for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

2. Conclusion

In summary, for the reasons provided in this Reply Brief, and for the reasons provided in appellant's Appeal Brief, appellant believes the art of record does not teach nor suggest the subject matter of claims 1-33. These claims are therefore believed to be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & HART, LLP

By: /Gregory W. Osterloft/
Gregory W. Osterloft
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 295-8205